



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,483	01/23/2004	Purva R. Rajkotia	2004.01.014.WS0	7033
23990	7590	04/21/2006	EXAMINER	
DOCKET CLERK P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			GARY, ERIKA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,483

Applicant(s)

RAJKOTIA ET AL.

Examiner

Erika A. Gary

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/764,164. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both teach controlling the use of a reduced cycle mode of a mobile station. The only difference in the claim sets is that the mobile station sends the reduced slot cycle index value request in a page response message as opposed to sending it in first release order message.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelley et al., US Patent Number 6,822,973 (hereinafter Kelley).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Kelley for use in a wireless network, a base station capable of controlling the use of the reduced slot cycle mode by a selected one of a plurality of mobile stations communicating with said base station, said base station comprising: a message controller capable of transmitting a Page message to a first mobile station notifying said first mobile station that a data session between said base station and said first mobile station is being activated; and a reduced slot cycle controller coupled said message controller capable of receiving from said first mobile station a Page Response message comprising a minimum reduced slot cycle index (SCI) value requested by said first mobile station, wherein said reduced slot cycle controller, in response to receipt of said Page Response message, causes said message controller transmit said first mobile station a Release Order message comprising a selected slot cycle index (SCI) value at which said first mobile station will

Art Unit: 2617

operate [figs. 2, 5; col. 2: lines 28-67; col. 4: lines 1-12; col. 6: lines 1-3; col. 7: lines 24-26].

Regarding claims 2, 8, 14, and 20, Kelley discloses a slot cycle duration corresponding to the selected SCI value transmitted by the base station is different than a slot cycle duration corresponding to the minimum reduced slot cycle index (SCI) value requested by the first mobile station [col. 5: lines 36-44].

Regarding claims 3, 9, 15, and 21, Kelley discloses the slot cycle duration corresponding the selected SCI value transmitted by base station is at least as great as a slot cycle duration corresponding the minimum reduced slot cycle index (SCI) value requested by the first mobile station [col. 7: lines 38-41].

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16, and 22, Kelley discloses the page response message further comprises a requested time period during which the first mobile station will operate using the reduced slot cycle index (SCI) value requested by the first mobile station, and wherein said Release Order message further comprises a selected time period during which the first mobile station will operate using the selected SCI value [col. 5: lines 35-44].

Regarding claims 5, 11, 17, and 23, Kelley discloses the selected time period transmitted by the base station is different than the requested time period requested by the first mobile station [col. 5: lines 42-44; col. 8: lines 42-54].

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18, and 24 Kelley discloses the selected time period transmitted by the base station is at least as great as the requested time period requested by the first mobile station [col. 8: lines 10-18].

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jang et al., US Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0007973, disclose a method for requesting and granting a shorter slot cycle in a wireless network.

Kinnavy, US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0114156, discloses a method and mobile station for enabling a preferred slot cycle.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erika A. Gary whose telephone number is 571-272-7841. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EAG
April 19, 2006


ERIKA A. GARY
PRIMARY EXAMINER